

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

American Opinion Summary

Department of State

Permanent file copy

Do not remove

No. 105

October 25, 1962

POLICY TOWARD RUSSIA AND CUBA

The possibility of U.S.-Soviet negotiation on Cuba is welcomed by a number of observers. As the New York Times expresses it, if Khrushchev's message to Bertrand Russell "means negotiation with a serious purpose, it is a suggestion that can be welcomed." The New York Herald Tribune sees in President Kennedy's expressed willingness "to discuss new proposals for the removal of tensions" an invitation to parley, and says: "We hope Khrushchev will accept it."

But a condition is held to be that Khrushchev must demonstrate his sincerity by action. "If Premier Khrushchev is ready to negotiate honestly...he can prove it by dismantling the missile bases in Cuba," the New York Times comments. The Herald Tribune says: "Khrushchev would be well advised not to attempt to force our quarantine of Cuba."

A "broad new field for useful negotiations would be opened up," if Moscow "is now willing to give up its aggressive gesture in Cuba," the Washington Post observes. As "one example" of "a face-saving out for the rival great powers," the Post suggests that "both Latin America and Africa be proclaimed denuclearized zones."

We cannot withdraw from Berlin as a quid pro quo for Soviet withdrawal from Cuba, the Providence Journal asserts. It then goes on to say: "Whether we might consider offering the Soviet Union a path of retreat by agreeing to give up some other bases...which have been rendered obsolescent by missile technology, is another question."

Walter Lippmann suggests a Cuba-Turkey deal. After pointing out that Berlin and Cuba are not comparable, he says: "The only place that is truly comparable with Cuba is Turkey." Citing the parallels between the U.S.-Turkey position and the Soviet-Cuba position, he declares: "The two bases could be dismantled without altering the world balance of power."

A few emphasize the difference between Cuba and Turkey. "The difference is all the difference between offense and defense," the Christian Science Monitor asserts. The Chicago Tribune cites in addition the fact "that in nearly four years of the Castro regime, the Cuban people have not been given the chance to express their approval or disapproval of its policies."

Public Opinion Studies Staff • Bureau of Public Affairs

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

- 2 -

POLICY TOWARD RUSSIA AND CUBA
(Contd.)

The U.S. position has been strengthened by its power move, the Wall Street Journal suggests. It is "entirely possible that President Kennedy's show of strength, the decisiveness which removes uncertainties, has helped produce the support of friendly nations," this paper says, adding: "We may finally" make Russia realize that it "must stop its world-wide aggressions" because the U.S. has had enough (somewhat similarly, Wash. Star).

"There is no element so powerful in international politics as the possession of force and the willingness to use it," AP analyst J.M. Roberts comments. "Until it is used, it remains political," he adds, and it remains for the U.S. "to make this political effort at every point where the Soviets may seek to retaliate."

Some give Russia the credit for the welcome Latin American backing of the U.S. "The Soviet nuclear threat...has forged a union of twenty American republics which had been badly divided over the Castro regime," the New York Herald Tribune points out. The contest is no longer one between one American republic and Russia, it says, "but between twenty American republics and the Soviet Union." Hearst's New York Journal-American concludes: "Moscow's missiles have produced a fusion in a way that Khrushchev never intended."

Scripps-Howard's Washington News suggests that Russia has not only united the OAS "as it has never before been united," but has helped "cement the already strong NATO alliance."

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

OFFICIAL USE ONLY